

REMARKS

Status of Claims

By way of the instant amendment, Claims 1-5, 8-9 and 40-41 have been cancelled. Thus, Claims 6, 7, and 10-39 remain for examination.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the claims in order to remove the basis for the objections as stated in paragraph 2 of the outstanding office action. It is submitted that all of applicant's claims fully comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Abstract of the Disclosure

Although not requested by the examiner, applicant has amended the abstract to place it more in compliance with United States practice. In particular, the abstract has been changed from a two paragraph format to a one paragraph format, and a number of words has been reduced to below 150 as required by the PTO rules.

Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Hayball (6,308,174). Further, Claims 2-14, 18-19, 25-29, 33-34 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Hayball in view of Stevens (6,539,425).

The examiner has indicated that Claims 15-17, 20-24, 30-32 and 35-39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

By way of the instant amendment, Claims 15-17, 20-24, 30-32 and 35-39 had been amended to place fee claims in independent form by incorporating therein. The limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. As such, these claims are deemed to be allowable.

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 40-41 have been cancelled.

Claim 6 has been amended to place this claim in independent form by combining therein the limitations of Claims 3 and 5 from which it depends. The examiner recognizes that the combined teaching of Hayball and Stevens do not recite these specific detailed steps

recited in applicant's Claim 6. The examiner states, however, that the research is recited in Claim 6 would be obvious and moreover the research results to be combined to restore the data reflecting a specific state wherein implementation variations in this process would be considered a design choice. However, the examiner oversimplifies applicant's recited Claim 6. The claim does not merely recite searching and combining generally, but rather recites very specifically accessing the current map tree, temporarily storing the information retrieved in a network configuration data storage section, accessing a temporary map tree and searching the temporary map tree for any temporary map entry information applicable to the time earlier than the time specified by the external application, and, wherein, if it is found that no such temporary map entry is available, returning the current map entry information to the external application unchanged, and if it is found that one or more such temporary map entries are available, collecting every entry information located under the temporary map entry and specified by the external application. The claim goes on to recite that the network configuration data control means is configured for merging the entry information under the temporary map entry and collected together with the current map tree previously stored in a network configuration data storage means, and collecting all temporary map entries and merging them to update the entry information under the current map entry and stored in the network configuration data storage means and returning the updated version of the information to the external application. Clearly, the combined teachings of Hayden and Stevens do not go so far as to make obvious the above enumerated limitations of applicant's claims and thus, the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 7 has also been placed in independent form by combining the recitations of Claim 3 into Claim 7. The examiner notes that Hayball does not teach the log map specifically recited in Claim 7. Hayball's teaching of recording historical configuration information, as shown in Figure 8, simply does not need applicant's claimed limitations. Stevens does not cure the defect of Hayball. As such, the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and Claim 7 is deemed allowable.

Claim 10 is also deemed allowable in as much as the prior art does not provide a teaching of the sorting of the data instructed in the request, termed a "request data", while

modifying the configuration data for each entry, and the order of the directory tree hierarchy beginning with a top level toward a bottom level. As such, Claim 10 and claims dependent therefrom are likewise deemed allowable.

Claim 25 is likewise deemed allowable. As claim recites, among other things, a sorting of the data instructed in the configuration change request in order of the directory tree hierarchy beginning with a top level toward a bottom level. This limitation, taken in combination with remaining claim limitations are not found in the combined teachings of Hayball and Stevens, and thus, the Patent and Trademark Office has not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims dependent on Claim 25 are likewise deemed allowable. Applicant notes that the broader claims originally contained in the application have been cancelled, but that the detailed recitations of applicant's implementation have been retained and are deemed to distinguish applicant's invention from the applied prior art.

Conclusions:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 4, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By David A. Blumenthal 36,489

DA David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257